

# **Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/022,010

Applicant(s)

DERNER ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph D. Torres

Art Unit

2133

## **All Participants:**

(1) Joseph D. Torres.

(2) Daniel Polglaze.

## **Status of Application: New Case**

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 8 April 2004

**Time:** 3:00pm

## **Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: *N/A.*

## **Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*N/A*

Claims discussed:

*1-26*

Prior art documents discussed:

*N/A*

## **Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

## **Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Attorney informed the Examiner that the Applicant had intended claim 11 to depend from claim 10. During a telephone conversation with Daniel Polglaze on 08 April 2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group III, claims 9-14 and 24-26. .